DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 128 430 95 TM 005 615

AUTHOR Arends, Jane H.; And Others
TITLE Evaluation Design for the Establishment of a Technical Assistance Unit in the Improving Teaching Competencies Program.
INSTITUTION Northwest Regional Educational Lab., Portland, Oreg.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Basic Skills Group. Learning Div.
PUB DATE Jun 76
CONTRACT 400-76-0046
NOTE 38p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Data Collection; Educational Programs; *Evaluation Methods; Feasibility Studies; *Information Dissemination; *Instructional Systems; Teacher Improvement; *Technical Assistance
IDENTIFIERS Improving Teaching Competencies Program

ABSTRACT

Establishment of a Technical Assistance Unit (TAU) is one of several work components of the Field Relations and Dissemination Work Unit of the Improving Teaching Competencies Program (ITCP) of the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory in fiscal year 1976. The purpose of establishing the TAU as an adjunct to other ITCP activities is to make available the ITCP's instructional systems. The purpose of this report is to present the evaluation design for the TAU. The report is divided into three main sections and includes several appendices. The first section describes: (1) the context for this evaluation, including its purposes; (2) the TAU as the subject and the primary audience of this evaluation; (3) objectives of the TAU in fiscal year 1976; and (4) questions to be answered in this evaluation. The second section of the report includes descriptions of five methods through which evaluation information will be obtained. The plan for reporting the information obtained is presented in the third section of the report. Contained in the appendices are time schedules for various evaluation activities, worksheets summarizing the evaluation questions, sources of information, instrumentation and reporting procedures, and postsession reaction form. (Author)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED128430

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE

The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: TM SP

In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view.

Evaluation Design for the Establishment of a Technical Assistance Unit in the Improving Teaching Competencies Program

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory

TM005 615

June 1976

Published by the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, a private nonprofit corporation. The work upon which this publication is based was performed pursuant to Contract 400-76-0046, with the Basic Skills Group/Learning Division of the National Institute of Education. It does not, however, necessarily reflect the views of that agency.

Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 710 S. W. Second Avenue, Portland, Oregon 97204

EVALUATION DESIGN FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE UNIT IN THE IMPROVING TEACHING COMPETENCIES PROGRAM

Prepared by

Jane H. Arends for the
Improving Teaching Competencies
Program Dissemination Work Unit

With the Assistance of

John Lohman, Program Director
William Ward, Work Unit Coordinator
Marilyn Rieff, Associate Work Unit
Coordinator

June 1976

Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
710 S. W. Second Avenue/Lindsay Building
Portland, Oregon 97204

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

CONTEXT OF THE EVALUATION 2

- Purposes of the Evaluation 2
- Description of the *Technical Assistance Unit* 4
- Objectives of the *Technical Assistance Unit* 5
- Evaluation Questions 7

METHODS OF OBTAINING EVALUATION INFORMATION 10

- Activity Report Forms 10
- Contact Record Forms 11
- Formal Documents and Records 12
- Informal Interviews 12
- Review Panel 12
- Post-Session Reaction Questionnaire 13
- Data Analysis Sessions 13

REPORTING PROCEDURES 15

APPENDIX A: Worksheets for Evaluation 16

APPENDIX B: Planned Time Schedule for Evaluation Activities 23

APPENDIX C: Activity Report Form and Instructions for Completing Activity Report Form 25

APPENDIX D: Contact Record Form and Instructions for Completing Contact Record Form 29

APPENDIX E: Post-Session Reaction Form 32

INTRODUCTION

Establishment of a *Technical Assistance Unit (TAU)* is one of several work components of the Field Relations and Dissemination Work Unit (FRDWU) of the Improving Teaching Competencies Program (ITCP) of the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory (NWREL) in fiscal year 1976. The purpose of establishing the *TAU* as an adjunct to other ITCP activities is to make available the ITCP's instructional systems.

The purpose of this report is to present the evaluation design for the *TAU*. The report is divided into three main sections and includes several appendices. The first section describes: (1) the context for this evaluation, including its purposes, (2) the *TAU* as the subject and the primary audience of this evaluation, (3) objectives of the *TAU* in fiscal year 1976, and (4) questions to be answered in this evaluation. The second section of the report includes descriptions of five methods through which evaluation information will be obtained. The plan for reporting the information obtained is presented in the third section of the report. Contained in the appendices are time schedules for various evaluation activities, worksheets summarizing the evaluation questions, sources of information, instrumentation and reporting procedures, and instrumentation.

CONTEXT OF THE EVALUATION

Purposes of the Evaluation

This evaluation is intended to serve three main purposes for the *Technical Assistance Unit (TAU)*, the Improving Teaching Competencies Program (ITCP) and the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory (NWREL). First, it is a study to determine the feasibility of establishing the *TAU*. As such, it will produce information that can be used to determine the manner in which the *TAU* should continue its work beyond fiscal year 1976 and that required in the ITCP's contract with the National Institute of Education (NIE). Second, it is intended to improve the *TAU's* functioning during fiscal year 1976. As such, information produced during the evaluation will be reported continuously to the *TAU*. ITCP, and NWREL. Third, it is intended to be a useful first stage of evaluation upon which subsequent evaluation could be built. As such, it will test procedures through which the feasibility and functioning of the *TAU* could be monitored in the future.

To accomplish these purposes, it is assumed that the *TAU*, ITCP and NWREL will, at one time or another, find use for four kinds of evaluation information. The first kind is diagnostic or <u>contextual</u>; *TAU* members will want to find out about the kinds of situations in which they will be involved. They will want to ascertain conditions they will meet as they begin each new activity. For example, before mailing out detailed information on a particular instructional system to a particular population of people, they will want to know if the intended recipients have already received more general, first-level material.

A second kind of evaluation concerns judgments of activities that might be tried; this is called <u>input</u> evaluation. More than one activity

is always feasible in technical assistance work, and *TAU* members will always make choices. They will consider various plans and compare their probable effects with established goals and objectives. For example, before deciding to have a face-to-face meeting with an individual who might be able to locate a client group for technical assistance, the *TAU* will have to decide if a letter or a phone call might not produce the desired result.

A third kind of evaluation, called process evaluation, will examine the short-term effects of *TAU* activities. What proportion of those receiving the mail-out brochure requested more information about ITCP instructional systems? Was the proportion greater or smaller when the brochure was handed out in conjunction with an oral presentation at a meeting? Were superintendents more likely than staff-development directors to call the *TAU* on their own initiative? Answers to questions like these will tell *TAU* members whether the processes they set in motion are having the desired effects in the short term.

A fourth sort of evaluation, product or outcome evaluation, tells whether activities produced results overall that justified the time and expense. *TAU* members will want outcome evaluation information to use in convincing others of the manner in which the *TAU* should be continued beyond fiscal year 1976. If they tailor the ITCP's validated instructional systems to better meet the needs of users, they will want information to begin validating the impact of the tailored systems.

There are two main reasons why the evaluation will concentrate on providing contextual, input and process evaluation information more than outcome evaluation information. First, the amount of time available for this evaluation is insufficient to study the long-term effects

of *TAU* actions; decisions about continuing the *TAU* must be made on information about its operation and short-term effects. Second, the ITCP already has evaluation information on the instructional systems that was collected while they were validated and has little need for more at this time. For these reasons, the evaluation will build the data base to which comparisons can be made in the future.

The evaluation does include an indirect means for providing outcome evaluation information since *TAU* members will be able to use information produced through diagnostic, input and process evaluation for that purpose if they so choose. In addition, *TAU* members will be asked to reflect upon the helpfulness of diagnostic, input and process evaluation activities and can shape these so they perhaps may have outcome evaluation usefulness.

Description of the *Technical Assistance Unit*

The *TAU* is at present one of six work components in the Field Relations and Dissemination Work Unit (FRDWU) of the Improving Teaching Competencies Program.[1] The FRDWU also has the following work components to complete: (1) developing a conceptual model[2] to guide dissemination and diffusion of ITCP instructional systems and other programs or products with similar aims and formate, (2) developing, implementing and evaluating[3] a strategy for disseminating selected ITCP instructional systems in Individually Guided Education (IGE) schools in collaboration

[1]See the *Resource Allocation and Management Plan* of the Improving Teaching Competencies Program, 1975, for details.
[2]See Arends, Richard I. *Strategies for Disseminating and Diffusing the Ideas, Practices, and Products of the Improving Teaching Competencies Program*, June 1976.
[3]See Reinhard, Diane L. *Evaluation Designs for Improving Teaching Competencies Program Dissemination Strategies*, June 1976.

with the Wisconsin Research and Development Center, (3) developing, implementing and evaluating a strategy for disseminating ITCP instructional systems in the Florida Teacher Center Network, (4) planning, implementing and evaluating three regional workshops using selected ITCP instructional systems and (5) serving in a field relations capacity to set up field test sites for the *Social Conflict and Negotiative Problem Solving* instructional system of the ITCP. In addition, *TAU* members are participants in the Inter-Lab Consortium that is exploring ways to increase utilization of the products of several research and development efforts.

Given that the same personnel may perform tasks in these five components and the Consortium as well as in the *TAU*, some evaluation activities will be aimed at answering questions to describe the *TAU* as a separate entity. A careful and precise delineation of critical activities by these personnel will allow categories to be developed which state clearly those activities relating to the *TAU*. Information on the necessary resources for *TAU* support then will help determine its feasibility, improve its functioning and provide test procedures for future monitoring.

Objectives of the *Technical Assistance Unit*

This section describes the *TAU's* objectives for fiscal year 1976 and relates these objectives to the purposes of this evaluation. The *TAU* has established the following objectives:

1. To provide technical assistance for any interested users of ITCP instructional systems
2. To ensure and facilitate the use of ITCP instructional systems on a shared-cost or a total cost contractual basis

3. To solicit and contract with new clients

4. To develop and implement multiple strategies for disseminating individual ITCP systems and clusters of ITCP systems such as Providing Organizational Development Skills (PODS)[4]

5. To document, study and analyze strategies used

6. To determine the extent to which the *TAU* can become self-supporting

7. To maintain a continuous relationship with the field to facilitate any future needs for field-based Research, Development, Dissemination and Evaluation (RDD&E) efforts

8. To reach a shared understanding of how this unit will interface with other Lab administrative units, e.g., Office of Dissemination and Marketing, Educational Services Division, etc.

Objective 5 will be accomplished by collecting information to serve all three evaluation purposes. Objective 6 will be accomplished through collecting information to determine the feasibility of the *TAU* and Objective 8 will be accomplished in part by collecting information intended to improve the *TAU's* functioning.

Objectives 1, 2, 3, 4 and 7 are of a different character. Rather than accomplishing these objectives by accomplishing the evaluation, the evaluation will determine whether and how they are accomplished. Whether they are accomplished will determine the feasibility of the *TAU*. How they are accomplished will determine what needs to be done to improve

---

[4]ITCP instructional systems included in the PODS cluster include:
Interpersonal Communications
Research Utilizing Problem Solving
Interpersonal Influence
Preparing Educational Training Consultants: Skills Training (PETC-I) and Group Process Skills (GPS)
Preparing Educational Training Consultants: Consulting (PETC-II)
Preparing Educational Training Consultants: Organizational Development (PETC-III)
Other ITCP instructional systems to be disseminated include:
Systematic and Objective Analysis of Instruction
Development of Higher Level Thinking Abilities
Facilitating Inquiry in the Classroom

the *TAU's* functioning and to monitor the *TAU's* functioning and feasibility in the future.

Evaluation Questions

This section includes questions to be answered by the evaluation activities described in this report. The same questions are included in the worksheets described in Appendix A. Questions related to feasibility are presented first and are followed by questions related to the *TAU's* functioning and questions related to procedures for monitoring the *TAU's* feasibility and functioning.

Questions related to the feasibility of the *TAU:*[5]

1. To what extent does the *TAU* provide technical assistance to any interested users of ITCP instructional systems and become self-supporting in doing so?

2. To what extent does the *TAU* ensure and facilitate the use of ITCP instructional systems on a shared-cost or a total cost contractual basis and become self-supporting in doing so?

3. To what extent does the *TAU* solicit and contract with new clients and become self-supporting in doing so?

4. To what extent does the *TAU* develop and implement multiple strategies for disseminating individual ITCP systems and clusters of systems such as PODS and become self-supporting in doing so?

5. To what extent does the *TAU* maintain a continuous relationship with the field to facilitate any future needs for field-based RDD&E efforts and become self-supporting in doing so?

[5]Five questions are asked to parallel the five relevant objectives (Objectives 1, 2, 3, 4 and 7) of the *TAU*. The basic question is implicit in a sixth objective (Objective 6); to what extent does the *TAU* become self-supporting in fiscal year 1976?

Questions Related to *TAU* functioning:[6]

6. What is the position of the *TAU* in its institutional environment? What components of the FRDWU, ITCP, NWREL, NIE and publishers are involved in *TAU* activities as goal-setters, funders, technical assisters or consultants, decision makers, etc.

7. What is the nature of *TAU's* institutional environment? From which components does the *TAU* draw resources of various kinds? What are the lines of accountability and influence between the *TAU* and other components? What are the histories and possible futures of interfaces of the components and the *TAU*?

8. What is the absolute and relative size of the *TAU* within the FRDWU in terms of FTE, budget, personnel qualifications?

9. To which pieces of work within the *TAU* are personnel and other resources allocated? What relative and absolute volumes of resources are expended on various pieces of work?

10. What are the methods of interacting with potential clients? (e.g., phone calls, print material, oral presentations, demonstration events, etc.) With what frequency and in what sequences are various methods used?

11. To what degree and in what ways are the methods tailored or adapted to specific potential clients? To what degree do the methods make use of new or invented channels and two-way communication as opposed to familiar or existing channels and one-way communication?

12. What costs are incurred by the *TAU* in using various methods? What are the relative and absolute volumes of resources expended by the *TAU* for these methods?

13. What methods and sequences of methods "work best," i.e., are most often associated with potential clients who become actual clients of the *TAU*?

---

[6]An examination of *TAU* functioning will enable the ITCP and NWREL to begin explaining <u>why</u> the *TAU* is feasible to the extent it proves to be and will enable the *TAU* to improve its functioning during fiscal year 1976. Such an examination requires (a) an analysis of the *TAU*, (b) an analysis of the *TAU's* clients (potential and actual) and (c) an analysis of interactions between the *TAU* and clients. An indepth examination of all possible variables in these three categories would take more time and staff than is available, so the questions here must be considered as only a preliminary or "starter" set which would be added to and refined in future evaluations.

14. What are the demographic features (age, position, race/ethnicity, location, academic background, experience in education, previous experience with NWREL, ITCP or instructional systems, etc.) of potential individual clients that most often are associated with becoming actual individual clients?

15. What are the demographic features of decision makers most often associated with committing others or the agency to be an actual client?

16. What are the demographic features of agencies (size, location, locus of decision making, type of agency and previous relationship with NWREL, ITCP or instructional systems, etc.) most often associated with becoming actual agency clients?

17. According to the reports of actual clients, through what methods did they become aware of the *TAU* and decide to make use of its products and services?

18. According to the reports of actual clients, in what ways do they intend to make use of the instructional systems and the *TAU* in the future?

Questions related to evaluation procedures:

19. To what extent are evaluation procedures specified in this design carried out as planned?

20. What factors account for deviations from these procedures, if any?

21. What do the *TAU*, ITCP and NWREL wish to recommend in terms of future procedures for monitoring the feasibility and functioning of the *TAU*?

METHODS OF OBTAINING EVALUATION INFORMATION

Because of the variety of information to be collected, a number of methods have been devised. Methods were selected to the following criteria: (1) high likelihood of producing the necessary information, (2) more than one way to gather most kinds of information in case one or more methods proves to be unworkable and (3) requiring only some additional effort on the part of present *TAU* staff members and only some new staff.

The methods to be employed are further intended to build the self-analytic capability of the *TAU* in line with its objectives "to document, study and analyze strategies used." For this reason, methods that were totally dependent upon the presence of outside evaluators have been rejected in favor of methods in which *TAU* members can participate. Audiences of this evaluation will be charged with reflecting upon the usefulness of the various methods at regular intervals during the study and with modifying them to better meet their information needs (see Evaluation Questions 19-21). The methods to be employed are included in the following sections.

Activity Report Forms

TAU members will be asked to log any activity that meets one or more of the following criteria: (1) it occurs on the 7th, 17th or 27th day of any month after June 1, 1976, (2) it bears a direct relationship to the *TAU* but has little to do with other work components of the FRDWU or (3) it does not directly concern *TAU* activities, but in the minds of *TAU* members it is extremely important and may have some indirect relationship to their abilities to do *TAU* work. A standardized form

will be provided (Appendix C) and some kind of duplication process (e.g., NCR paper) will make it possible for the author, the *TAU* file and evaluation staff to have copies.

Contact Record Forms

TAU members will keep a written record of all potential and actual clients who are sent any kind of dissemination information, who participate in any FRDWU-sponsored activity, or who initiate action vis-a-vis the FRDWU. A standardized form will be provided (see Appendix D) for recording data that became available after June 1, 1976. Importantly, the *TAU* already has a tremendous backlog of relevant data in the forms of: (1) a record of all incoming telephone calls that dates back several months, (2) lists of persons and institutions who have purchased instructional systems that have been (or can be) obtained from some of the firms that print or publish the instructional systems, (3) lists of persons to whom NWREL has sent information about the ITCP and its instructional systems and (4) a correspondence file that includes incoming letters and copies of outgoing letters and that dates back several years. Backlogged data will be transferred to Contact Record Forms only if (1) the person is involved[7] after June 1, 1976 and (2) *TAU* support staff can find an efficient way to do this. Evaluation staff may find it necessary to search some backlogged data without the convenience of having them on Contact Record Forms.

[7]Involvement here includes involvement in dissemination and evaluation activities described in Reinhard, Diane L. *Evaluation Design for ITCP Dissemination Strategies*, or Arends, Richard I. *Strategies for Disseminating and Diffusing the Ideas, Practices and Products of the Improving Teaching Competencies Program.* These data will become backlogged data during this evaluation unless forms are filled out with cross references to other reports and files.

Formal Documents and Records

Much of the information to be collected already exists in formal documents and records of the *TAU*, the FRDWU, the ITCP and NWREL. Examples of these sources include monthly computer printouts of the ITCP's budget; proposals, scope-of-work statements and contracts sent to NIE; evaluation reports by the ITCP; the instructional systems and dissemination literature. *TAU* members have agreed to facilitate the search by earmarking relevant parts of documents and records for the new evaluation staff upon request.

Informal Interviews

ITCP evaluation staff will have many opportunities to interview *TAU* staff informally. Evaluation staff will keep records of the questions asked and answers given. Examples of possible topics for interviews include: the contents of a particular formal document or record, additional data for some Activity Report or Contact Record Form and the satisfaction of *TAU* members with evaluation activities. Evaluation staff should not need to supplement informal interviews with formal ones (including the use of a written interview schedule) or questionnaires. If evaluation staff use any of these supplemental methods, copies of instrumentation and a summary of data collected will be included in the final report.

Review Panel

Some of the information to be collected concerns judgments of the activities of the *TAU*. A panel, comprised of two or three persons, will meet for two days in October to give *TAU* members feedback on their progress and plans. Evaluation staff will convene this session and

will collaborate with *TAU* members and both ITCP and NWREL decision makers in determining whose opinions and what specific judgments and feedback to seek.

Postsession Reaction Questionnaire

Some of the information to be collected concerns the judgments, impressions or reports of actual clients about the ways in which they became involved and have used or plan to use the services and products of the *TAU*. All actual clients who attend a workshop in which one or more of the instructional systems is used by the *TAU* unit will be asked to complete a standardized questionnaire. An identical questionnaire will be used in evaluating the FRDWU's activities in IGE schools, the Florida Teacher Center Network and regional workshops so comparisons may be made. In addition, all the items on the questionnaire have been used in one or more evaluation studies already completed by the ITCP and baseline data are available in reports.

Data Analysis Sessions

TAU members and other relevant ITCP and NWREL actors identified by the evaluation staff will meet periodically to examine data collected through other methods. Evaluation staff convening these sessions may report such findings as participant reactions to a particular workshop (a summary of data from a Postsession Reaction Questionnaire), what Activity Record Forms to date show about the relative success and cost of phone calls as a dissemination method or how evaluation procedures are being implemented. In addition, these sessions may be used to schedule or plan other evaluation activities such as the Expert Review Panel visit. Minutes of these meetings will be kept by the evaluation staff and excerpts will be appended to a final report.

Data collection procedures will always be monitored to insure that they protect the anonymity and privacy of subjects. Each *TAU* actor will be assigned a code name and asked to use this when completing all Activity Report Forms. Contact Record Forms will include the names of actual people with whom the *TAU* members interact, but these forms will not be made available to persons other than *TAU* members and evaluation staff and names or data that could be used to identify a particular potential or actual client of the *TAU* will be eliminated from the final report. Clients who complete Possession Reaction Forms will be advised of this policy and will be instructed in a way to complete the form without identifying themselves in any way that could be used to evaluate them as individuals.

REPORTING PROCEDURES

As has already been mentioned, excerpts of minutes of interim data analysis sessions conducted periodically throughout this study will be appended to a final report. This report will also include the following information: (1) a description of the context of the evaluation including its purposes, evaluation staff conducting it and the evaluation questions that guide it, (2) a description of methods used to obtain evaluation information, (3) a report of major findings[8] of the evaluation in the form of answers to evaluation questions and (4) a set of appendices to include reports by members of the Expert Review Panel, a summary of data obtained through informal interviews and documents or formal records searches, exerpts of minutes of interim data analysis sessions and summaries of data obtained through use of the Activity Report Forms, Contact Record Forms and Post-Session Reaction Forms.

[8]All findings will result from analyses of either of two kinds: determination of the average and of the variation. No statistical analyses to determine significant differences will be employed. All findings will take the form of descriptive narrative with summary tables, charts or graphs as appropriate.

Appendix A:

WORKSHEETS FOR EVALUATION

WORKSHEETS FOR THE EVALUATION

Evaluation Questions	Source(s) of Information	Methods of Collecting Information	When Information Is Collected[a]	Analysis and Form of Summary in Final Report
Evaluation Questions Related to the Feasibility of the *TAU*:				
1. To what extent does the *TAU* provide technical assistance to any interested users of ITCP instructional systems and become self-supporting in doing so?	*TAU* members ITCP and NWREL decision makers Review Panel members	Informal interviews Informal interviews Written reports of panel members and audio-tape of panel's presentation(s)	By September 30, 1976 By September 30, 1976 By October 30, 1976	Descriptive narrative and panel members' reports in appendices
2. To what extent does the *TAU* ensure and facilitate the use of ITCP instructional systems on a shared-cost or a total cost contractual basis and become self-supporting in doing so?	*TAU* members ITCP and NWREL decision makers Review Panel members	Informal interviews Informal interviews Written reports of panel members and audio-tape of panel's presentation(s)	By September 30, 1976 By September 30, 1976 By October 30, 1976	Descriptive narrative and panel members' reports in appendices
3. To what extent does the *TAU* solicit and contract with new clients and become self-supporting in doing so?	*TAU* members ITCP and NWREL decision makers Review Panel members	Informal interviews Informal interviews Written reports of panel members and audio-tape of panel's presentation(s)	By September 30, 1976 By September 30, 1976 By October 30, 1976	Descriptive narrative and panel members' reports in appendices

[a]Completion dates are related to the preparation of the report due for fiscal year 1976.

Worksheets for the Evaluation. Page Two

Evaluation Questions	Source(s) of Information	Methods of Collecting Information	When Information Is Collected[a]	Analysis and Form of Summary in Final Report
4. To what extent does the *TAU* develop and implement multiple strategies for disseminating individual ITCP systems and clusters of systems such as PODS and become self-supporting in doing so?	*TAU* members ITCP and NWREL decision makers Review Panel members	Informal interviews Informal interviews Written reports of panel members and audio-tape of panel's presentation(s)	By September 30, 1976 By September 30, 1976 By October 30, 1976	Descriptive narrative and panel members' reports in appendices
5. To what extent does the *TAU* maintain a continuous relationship with the field to facilitate any future needs for field-based RDD&E efforts and become self-supporting in doing so?	*TAU* members ITCP and NWREL decision makers Review Panel members	Informal interviews Informal interviews Written reports of panel members and audio-tape of panel's presentation(s)	By September 30, 1976 By September 30, 1976 By October 30, 1976	Descriptive narrative and panel members' reports in appendices
Evaluation Questions Related to *TAU* Functioning: 6. What is the position of the *TAU* in its institutional environment? What components of the FRDWU, ITCP, NWREL, NIE and publishers are involved in *TAU* activities as setters, funders, technical assisters or consultants, decision makers, etc.?	*TAU* members Actors or documents identified by *TAU* members	Informal interviews Interview and/or search	By August 30, 1976 By September 30, 1976	Descriptive narrative and diagrams or charts depicting components that interface with *TAU* and the function(s) each component performs

[a]Completion dates are related to the preparation of the report due for fiscal year 1976.

Worksheets for the Evaluation, Page Three

Evaluation Questions	Source(s) of Information	Methods of Collecting Information	When Information Is Collected[a]	Analysis and Form of Summary in Final Report
7. What is the nature of *TAU's* institutional environment? From which components does the *TAU* draw resources of various kinds? What are the lines of accountability and influence between the *TAU* and other components? What are the histories and possible futures of interfaces of the components and the *TAU*?	*TAU* members Actors or documents identified by *TAU* members	Informal interviews Interview and/or search	By August 30, 1976 By September 30, 1976	Descriptive narrative and diagrams or charts depicting the nature of organizational arrangements and variation in these over time
8. What is the absolute and relative size of the *TAU* within the FRDWU in terms of FTE, budget, personnel qualifications?	*TAU* members ITCP Budget Manager (Grupp) and computer printouts	Informal interviews Interview and search	August 30, 1976 Monthly through September 30, 1976	Descriptive narrative and tables as needed
9. To which pieces of work within the *TAU* are personnel and other resources allocated? What relative and absolute volumes of resources are expended on various pieces of work?	*TAU* members ITCP Budget Manager (Grupp) and computer printouts *TAU* members	Informal interviews Interview and search Activity Report Form	By August 30, 1976 Monthly through September 30, 1976 Ongoing through September 30, 1976	Descriptive narrative and tables, graphs or charts as needed to show patterns of assignments and resource use over time; summary of Activity Report Form data in appendix

[a]Completion dates are related to the preparation of the report due for fiscal year 1976.

Worksheets for the Evaluation, Page Four

Evaluation Questions	Source(s) of Information	Methods of Collecting Information	When Information Is Collected[a]	Analysis and Form of Summary in Final Report
10. What are the methods of interacting with potential clients? (e.g., phone calls, print materials, oral presentations, demonstration events, etc.)? With what frequency and in what sequences are various methods used?	*TAU* members	Activity Report Forms	Ongoing through September 30, 1976	Descriptive narrative with minutes and summaries of Activity Report and Contact Record Forms data in appendices
	TAU members	Contact Record Forms	Ongoing through September 30, 1976	
	TAU members	Minutes of Interim Data-Analysis Sessions	As scheduled before September 30, 1976	
11. To what degree and in what ways are the methods tailored or adapted to specific potential clients? To what degree do the methods make use of new or invented channels and two-way communication as opposed to familiar or existing channels and one-way communication?	*TAU* members	Activity Report Forms	Ongoing through September 30, 1976	Descriptive narrative with minutes, summaries of Activity Report and Contact Record Forms data and panel members' reports in appendices
	TAU members	Contact Record Forms	Ongoing through September 30, 1976	
	TAU members	Minutes of Interim Data-Analysis Sessions	As scheduled before September 30, 1976	
	Review Panel Members	Written reports of panel members and audio-tape of panel's presentation(s)	By October 30, 1976	
12. What costs are incurred by the *TAU* in using various methods? What are the relative and absolute volumes of resources expended by the *TAU* for these methods?	*TAU* members	Activity Report Forms	Ongoing through September 30, 1976	Descriptive narrative with charts and tables as appropriate to show averages and variation in cost by method; summary of Activity Report Form data in appendices
	ITCP Budget Manager (Grupp) and computer printouts	Interview and search	Monthly through September 30, 1976	

[a]Completion dates are related to the preparation of the report due for fiscal year 1976.

Evaluation Questions	Source(s) of Information	Methods of Collecting Information	When Information Is Collected[a]	Analysis and Form of Summary in Final Report
13. What methods and sequences of methods "work best," i.e., are most often associated with potential clients who become actual clients of the *TAU*?	*TAU* members Review Panel Members	Contact Record Forms Written reports of panel members and audio-tape of panel's presentation(s)	Ongoing through September 30, 1976 By October 30, 1976	Descriptive narrative with summary of Contact Record Form data and reports of panel members in appendices
14. What are the demographic features (age, position, race/ethnicity, location, academic background, experience in education, previous experience with NWREL, ITCP or instructional systems, etc.) of potential individual clients that most often are associated with becoming actual individual clients?	*TAU* members	Contact Record Forms (Side A)	Ongoing through September 30, 1976	Descriptive narrative with summary of Contact Record Form data in appendix
15. What are the demographic features of decision-makers most often associated with committing others or the agency to be an actual client?	*TAU* members	Contact Record Forms (Side A)	Ongoing through September 30, 1976	Descriptive narrative with summary of Contact Record Form data in appendix
16. What are the demographic features of agencies (size, location, locus of decision-making, type of agency and previous relationships with NWREL, ITCP or instructional systems, etc.) most often associated with becoming actual agency clients?	*TAU* members	Contact Record Form (Side A)	Ongoing through September 30, 1976	Descriptive narrative with summary of Contact Record Form data in appendix

[a]Completion dates are related to the preparation of the report due for fiscal year 1976.

Worksheets for the Evaluation, Page Six

Evaluation Questions	Source(s) of Information	Methods of Collecting Information	When Information Is Collected[a]	Analysis and Form of Summary in Final Report
17. According to the reports of actual clients, through what methods did they become aware of the *TAU* and decide to make use of its products and services?	Actual clients	Post Session Reaction Forms	As available through September 30, 1976	Descriptive narrative with tables of raw data as needed in body or appendix
18. According to the reports of actual clients, in what ways do they intend to make use of the instructional systems and the *TAU* in the future?	Actual clients	Post Session Reaction Forms	As available through September 30, 1976	Descriptive narrative with tables of raw data as needed in body or appendix
Evaluation Questions Related to Evaluation Procedures:				
19. To what extent are evaluation procedures specified in this design carried out as planned?	*TAU* members and evaluation staff	Minutes of Interim Data-Analysis Sessions	As scheduled before September 30, 1976	Descriptive narrative with samples or quotations as needed for illustrations
20. What factors account for deviations from these procedures, if any?	*TAU* members and evaluation staff	Minutes of Interim Data-Analysis Sessions	As scheduled before September 30, 1976	Descriptive narrative with exerpts of minutes of sessions in appendices
21. What do the *TAU*, ITCP and NWREL wish to recommend in terms of future procedures for monitoring the feasibility and functioning of the *TAU*?	*TAU* members, ITCP and NWREL decision makers	Informal interviews	By September 30, 1976	Descriptive narrative with quotations or samples as needed for illustration

[a]Completion dates are related to the preparation of the report due for fiscal year 1976.

Appendix B:

PLANNED TIME SCHEDULE FOR
EVALUATION ACTIVITIES

PLANNED TIME SCHEDULE
FOR EVALUATION ACTIVITIES

Activity	Beginning Date	Completion Date[a]	Approximate Days Per Month								
			Apr	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	FY 77[b]
Design evaluation study and instrumentation	4/1/76	6/1/76	8	8	3						
Secure ITCP, NWREL, NIE approval of design	5/15/76	6/15/76			2						
Refine instrumentation	6/15/76	7/30/76			2	2					*
Collect or provide data to answer evaluation questions	6/1/76	10/30/76			20	20	20	20	20		*
Participate in interim data-analysis sessions	6/30/76	10/30/76			5	5	5	5	5		*
Elicit judgments from expert review panel	10/1/76	10/30/76							14		
Prepare report, secure ITCP and NWREL approval, forward to NIE	10/1/76	11/30/76						8	8	16	

[a]Completion dates are related to the preparation of the report due for fiscal year 1976.

[b]Activities followed by an asterisk in the FY 77 column are those which would continue should the *TAU* receive funding.

Appendix C:

ACTIVITY REPORT FORM AND INSTRUCTIONS
FOR COMPLETING ACTIVITY REPORT FORM

ACTIVITY REPORT FORM

Person Reporting: _____ Date(s): _____

Length: _____

Other(s) Involved in Activity:

Relevant Preparation: Time Taken: _____

Purpose(s) of Activity:

Description of Activity:

Plans for Action: Time Estimated: _____

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING ACTIVITY REPORT FORMS

Persons Reporting: Use the first three letters of your mother's maiden name as your code if you wish.

Date: This space is for the date(s) on which the activity occurred. Use more than one day only for activities such as a workshop where the days necessarily connect. If you complete the form on a day other than the day in which the activity occurred, write in the reporting date also, but put it in parentheses.

e.g., Activity date: 6/27 Reporting date: (6/29)

Length: Record the total number of minutes, hours or days spent in the activity. Do not include preparation or followup time in the total, but record those figures under "Time Taken" or "Time Estimated" (see below). If the activity is completed in pieces, such as a one-hour meeting and a 20-minute phone call, record the total in this space and note time used for each piece under "Description of Activity."

Other(s) Involved in Activity: Write the name of each individual involved unless you have a name for the group, e.g., "participants at IPC workshop in Nadville" or "all superintendents on NWREL's mailing list." Use a group name only when you could retrieve a list of individuals if this was needed later. Personal reactions to other(s) may be included if desired. Cross-reference names to Contact Record Form when entries should be added there.

Relevant Preparation: List any known steps that led up to the activity. Tell who did what, if someone besides yourself was involved. You don't have to describe activities that were only peripherally antecedent to this one, i.e., no one should ever have to write, "Chic, Ruth and René developed *PETC-I*." Include references to other relevant Activity Report Forms if it will save time or space to do so.

Purpose(s) of Activity: This part is pretty straight-forward when you initiate the activity--just tell why you did it. If other people initiate the activity, you can record what you understand to be their reason(s) or simply note that you were responding to their agenda.

Description of Activity: In this section, be sure to note the following: (1) context (phone, face-to-face, presentation, letter, workshop, etc.), (2) mode (oral, written, audio-visual, etc.), (3) information given, (4) information received, (5) tone, mood or climate of activity (e.g., rushed or leisurely, friendly or hostile, etc.) and (6) references to relevant pieces of paper (i.e., if the activity is "writing a letter and enclosing a blue brochure," both a copy of the letter and the brochure should be retrievable if needed later). Personal reflections about how the activity worked may be included.

Plans for Followup Action: Describe here any steps that will or are supposed to be taken after the activity. Record names if persons other than yourself will be involved. Don't bother to describe long-range outcomes like "a workshop will be offered in Mudville to establish a cadre"--especially if other activities will precede that followup action. Keep it simple, e.g., "I will mail materials," or "He'll call back in two weeks." Stick to descriptions of agreements and specifics other than including your hopes and fears. Estimate time in minutes, hours or days as appropriate. Personal predictions of outcomes to result from followup activities may be included.

General Procedures: It will be important to pick activities so that they are neither too complicated nor too small. If in one afternoon you write five letters to people who have requested similar information and talk to three people on the phone who want to know the same things as those you are writing to, you probably should complete two forms--one for the letters and one for the calls. If, over a three-day period, you sent out 400 brochures and do many other things as well, you should complete one form for "brochure sending" and other forms as needed for other activities. If you have a day with many, many little activities and don't want to write each one up separately, complete one form like "spent the afternoon in my office reading mail, cleaning off my desk and drafting the progress report." Each individual will no doubt define "activity" differently from other individuals and differently on different days, but periodic discussions in Interim Data-Analysis Sessions of what constitutes an activity should produce greater consistency eventually.

Sometimes more than one person from the *TAU* will be involved in an activity. In that circumstance, it is not necessary for everyone to fill out the form. Just be sure to agree who will do it. The important thing is to create the most complete and accurate file possible of the most critical and most common actions of *TAU* members.

One copy of the NCR form stays with its author. Another copy goes to the general *TAU* file where other *TAU* members have access to it. The third copy goes to evaluation staff.

Appendix D:

CONTACT RECORD FORM AND INSTRUCTIONS
FOR COMPLETING CONTACT RECORD FORM

CONTACT RECORD FORM

(Side A of 5 x 8 card)

State: _____

Agency: _____

Name: _____

Address: _____

Known Characteristics of Person:	Date/ Recorder:	Known Characteristics of Agency:	Date/ Recorder:

(Side B of 5 x 8 card)

Date: Initiator/Activity/Relevant Reports/ Files, etc.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING
CONTACT RECORD FORMS

Demographic Information: The first three lines are absolutely essential since cards are to be filed by state, by agency (district, REA, SEA) within state, and then by person within agency. Information about address can be optional if it is available elsewhere. If the person moves to another agency or state, staple a new card in front of the old and refile accordingly.

Known Characteristics of Person and Agency: For the person, record position in agency and relevant history with ITCP at minimum. Position data need not be very specific, but it should designate whether the person is a potential client, one who makes decisions about clienthood for others, or both. For the agency, record general type (schools, district, state department, etc.), division or subsystem of agency that is most involved and prior history with ITCP at minimum. For persons, other characteristics might include age, sex, years in position or agency, race/ethnicity. For agencies, other characterisitcs might include size, total number of subsystems and length of time in existence. Date all entries by month and year so changes in characteristics are visible. Initial all entries under Recorder.

Date: Month and year should be sufficient unless you predict multiple entries within a month.

Initiator/Activity: Entries in this space should be stated in the form who did what. For example, entries on Art Garfunkle's card might read as follows:

NWREL sent brochure about *PETC-I*
Art requested additional info on other systems
Ward sent description of ITCP systems
Rieff sent flyer announcing Denver IPI workshop
Art signed up for same
Art attended same

Brief entries are sufficient as long as specific data (e.g., which brochure) are retrievable when needed. Entries should include cross-references to Activity Report Forms and other documents or files when these are known. The important thing is to create the most complete and accurate record possible of the most critical interactions between the *TAU* and the client.

General Procedures: It will be important to code cards as to current *TAU* status of the person and a sequence of color coded metal clips on the top of the card will serve this purpose. Color coding should indicate the following: (a) this active client is currently signed up for technical assistance, (b) this is a potential client because there has been an entry within the last month and (c) this is a dropout because there is no entry less than a month old. A series of clips across the top of the card will show changes (or lack of them) in status and the appropriate clip should be added to the card at the end of the month. The clip on the right will indicate current status and the first entry under Initiator/Activity will indicate how far back the history goes.

Appendix E:

POSTSESSION REACTION FORM

POST-SESSION REACTION FORM

(To be developed.)